

Integrated Regional Water Management Grant Program

Draft Step 2

Implementation Grants

Proposal Solicitation Package

Public Meetings

Sacramento
July 28, 2005

Los Angeles
August 4, 2005

Agenda

- Welcome and Introductions
- General Information
- Review content of Step 2 PSP
- Questions & Answers
- Public Comments

Yellow – Emphasis added; Annotations

Red Italics – PSP to be modified

IRWM Grant Program Current Status

- Planning Grants
 - Received 54 proposals
 - Requesting \$22 million
 - \$12 million available
 - Completing Reviews
 - On schedule for October Public Meeting and November awards

IRWM Grant Program Current Status

- Step 1
 - Received 50 proposals
 - Requesting \$1.4 billion
 - \$148 million available
 - Starting Technical Review
 - Call back in December 2005

Implementation Grants Application Process

- Two-step Process
 - Step 1
 - Conceptual Proposal
 - Step 2
 - Selected proposals called back
 - Detailed proposal

General Information

- Will use FFAST again
- Submit electronic and hardcopies
- 13 Mandatory Attachments
- 5 Additional Attachments
 - Must complete if applicable



Contents of PSP

Foreword

- Applicant Workshops
- Fill-able Tables
- Points of Contact

Table 1

FAAST Checklist

- Answer all questions
- Item 7
 - What to submit
 - CDs and Hardcopies
- *To add contact person for application problems*

Section III Eligibility Requirements

Urban Water Management Plans

- Urban Water Management Planning Act
 - Step 2 Proposals will be due early 2006
 - Updated UWMPs due December 31, 2005
 - Submitted and deemed complete
 - Submitted and deemed incomplete
 - *Submitted and DWR not finished with review*
 - Not submitted
- Will need a complete 2005 UWMP by award date – mid-2006

Section III Eligibility Requirements

Groundwater Management Plans

- Groundwater Management Plan required for:
 - Groundwater Management and Recharge Projects
 - Projects with potential groundwater impacts
 - Negative Impacts
 - Positive Impacts

Section III Eligibility Requirements

Groundwater Management Plans

- Groundwater Management Plan
- Consent to be subject to GWMP or other...
- Proposal includes development of GWMP
 - *Within 1-year of Step 2 application due date*
- Conforms to requirements of an adjudication...

Attachment 1

Authorizing Documentation

- Used for eligibility
- Exhibit A
- Similar to Step 1
- Authorization to execute a grant agreement

Attachment 2

Eligible Applicant Documentation

- Used for eligibility
- Exhibit B
- Similar to Step 1

Attachment 3

Work Plan

- Scored
- Exhibit C
 - Introduction
 - Work Items
- Will be used as scope of work for grant agreement

Attachment 4

Budget

- Scored
- Exhibit D
 - Table D-1
 - Individual Project Budgets
 - Summary Budget

Attachment 5

Schedule

- Scored
- Individual project schedules
- Summary Proposal schedule
- Assume July 1, 2006 effective date
 - Actual effective date may be different
- Readiness to Proceed

Attachment 6

Funding Match

- Scored
- Exhibit E
 - Sliding scale
 - Adjusted for Disadvantaged Communities
- % based on total proposal costs

Attachment 7

Economic Analysis of Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits

- Scored
- Exhibit F
 - Economic Analysis
 - Water Supply Benefits
 - Water Quality Benefits

Exhibit F

Economic Analysis of Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits

- Present Proposal Costs
 - Entire Proposal
- Present Proposal Benefits
 - Water Supply and Water Quality
 - Other Expected Benefits in Attachment 8
- Determine Benefit/Cost Ratio

Exhibit F

Economic Analysis of Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits

- Quantitative
 - Economic Terms
 - Physical Terms
- Qualitative
- Not intended to bias
 - Water Supply over Water Quality
 - Drinking Water over Environmental Water
 - Quantitative Benefits or Qualitative Benefits

Exhibit F

Economic Analysis of Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits

- Analysis Guidelines and Assumptions
- Information to be included
- Will post complete excel tables
 - 50 years
 - Discount Factors

Exhibit F

Economic Analysis of Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits

- Proposal Costs
 - Table F-3
- Proposal Benefits
 - Series of tables
 - Table F-4 Annual WS/WQ Benefits
 - Economically or physically quantified
 - Table F-5 Annual Avoided Costs

Exhibit F

Economic Analysis of Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits

- Proposal Benefits
 - Table F-6 Annual Other WS/WQ Benefits
 - Not included in Tables F-4 or F-5
 - Table F-7 Total Benefits
 - Table F-8 B/C Ratio

Attachment 8

Other Expected Benefits

- Scored
- Exhibit G
 - Benefits not addressed in Attachment 7
 - Non-water supply/water quality
 - Listed examples not inclusive
 - Quantitative or Qualitative
 - Cost analysis addressed in Attachment 7

Attachment 9

Scientific and Technical Merit

- Scored
- *Text box - misplaced*
- Exhibit H
 - Introduction
 - Technical Adequacy
 - Environmental Documentation & Permits
 - Certifications of Feasibility
 - 3 Certifications, as necessary
 - Supporting Documentation

Attachment 10

Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

- Scored
- Exhibit I
 - Monitoring
 - Assessment
 - Performance Measures

Attachment 11

Program Preferences

- Scored
- See Guidelines Section II.E

Attachment 12

Statewide Priorities

- Considered by Selection Panel
- See Guidelines Section II.F

Attachment 13

Financial Statements

- Considered by Selection Panel
- Submit for each agency that will receive grant funding
- Fiscal capacity to handle project costs

Attachment 14

Disadvantaged Communities

- If applicable
- Project Benefit Ratio

$$\text{PBR} = \frac{\text{DAC Pop}_{\text{Served}}}{\text{Total Pop}_{\text{Served}}}$$

- Exhibit J
 - Certificate of Understanding

Attachment 15

Changes to Proposal from Step 1

- If applicable
- Improvements
- No material changes
- Call Back letter
- Determine continued eligibility

Attachment 16

Modifications of River or Stream Channel

- If applicable
- Document that channel modifications will be fully mitigated
- Benefits exceed negative impacts
- If not, that portion of proposal not eligible for funding

Attachment 17

CALFED ROD Consistency

- If applicable
- Exhibit K
 - “Goals” versus “Objectives”

Attachment 18

Letters of Support or Opposition

- If applicable
- Submit via FAAST
- Specificity in letters
- Address to Tracie or Shahla

Tracie Billington
DWR – DPLA
P.O. Box 942836
Sacramento CA 94236-0001

Shahla Farahnak
State Water Board – DFA
1001 I Street, 16th Floor
Sacramento CA 95814

General Scoring Standard

A score of **5 points...** fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale.

A score of **4 points...** is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale.

A score of **3 points...** less than fully addressed and documentation and/or rationale are incomplete or insufficient.

A score of **2 points...** marginally addressed.

A score of **1 point...** not addressed or no documentation or rationale is presented.

Table 3

Scoring Criteria & Scoring Standard

- Criteria
- Weighting Factor
- Range of Points Possible
- Scoring Standard
 - This is the important part

Table 3

Work Plan

- Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the Proposal.
 - Are work items for each project of adequate detail and completeness so that it is clear that the project can be implemented?
 - Do the work items include appropriate work item submittals (i.e., quarterly and final reports)?
 - Do the work items collectively implement the Proposal?
 - Do the work items match the schedule?
 - Does the work plan identify synergies or linkages between and among projects?

Table 3

Work Plan

- General Scoring Standard

Table 3

Budget

- Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific budget that adequately documents the Proposal.
 - Is the detail of the budget commensurate with the design stage claimed by the applicant?
 - Was a detailed budget provided for each project contained in the Proposal?
 - Do the items shown in the budget agree with the tasks shown in the Work Plan and Schedule?
 - Are the detailed costs shown for each project reasonable?
 - Are all the costs shown in the budget supported by documentation, if required, and is that documentation complete?

Table 3

Budget

- 5 points – all the projects... have detailed cost information; the costs are reasonable, and all the budget categories are thoroughly supported
- 4 points – all the projects... have detailed cost information and the costs are considered reasonable but the supporting documentation... not fully supported or lack detail
- 3 points – most of the projects... have detailed cost information but not all costs appear reasonable or supporting documentation is lacking for a majority of the items...
- 2 points – less than half the projects... have detailed cost information, many of the costs cannot be verified as reasonable, or supporting documentation is lacking...
- 1 point – no detailed budget information provided for any of the proposed projects.

Table 3

Schedule

- Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific schedule that adequately documents the Proposal and on the readiness to proceed with the Proposal.
 - Does the schedule correspond to the work items described in the work plan and budget?
 - Given the work item descriptions in Attachment 3, does the schedule seem reasonable?
 - How many months occur between the assumed contract execution date and the start of construction for the earliest of the Proposal projects?

Table 3

Schedule

- **5 points** – consistent and reasonable and... a readiness to begin construction or implementation of **all elements** of the Proposal by **January 1, 2007**.
- **4 points** – consistent and reasonable and... a readiness to begin construction or implementation **one or more** of the elements of the Proposal by **January 1, 2007**.
- **3 points** – nearly consistent and reasonable or... readiness to begin construction or implementation **after January 1, 2007 but before July 1, 2007**.
- **2 points** – clearly not consistent, not reasonably achievable, or... a readiness to begin construction or implementation **after July 1, 2007 but before January 1, 2008**.
- **1 point** – does not follow the work items presented in the work plan and budget, is clearly not reasonable, or... a readiness to begin construction or implementation **after January 1, 2008**.

Table 3

Funding Match

- The scoring standard or the adjusted scoring standard for disadvantaged communities will be used to score the Funding Match criterion.
 - Is the funding match at least 10% of the total cost of the Proposal, unless a reduction or waiver in the funding match has been submitted?
 - What is the percentage of the funding match as compared to the total cost of the Proposal?

Table 3

Funding Match

- 5 points 60% or greater
- 4 points 45 - 59.9%
- 3 points 30 - 44.9%
- 2 points 20 - 29.9%
- 1 points 10.0 - 19.9 %
- Fail <10%
- Or Adjusted DAC Scale

Table 3

Economic Analysis – Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits

- Scoring will be based on the economic benefits of the Proposal. The scores will be assigned relative to all other Proposals. Scoring is designed to not bias water supply and water quality projects with respect to each other.
 - Does the application contain a complete economic analysis, include the life cycle costs and the water supply and water quality benefits?
 - Is the economic analysis supported with adequate documentation?
 - Does the application contain a benefit/cost ratio and is that ratio reasonable?

Table 3

Economic Analysis – Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits

- The minimum score for this criterion is 1 point.
- The remaining 4 points will be allocated based on:
 - Benefit/cost ratio;
 - Quantitative analysis in physical terms for benefits that cannot be quantified in economic terms;
 - The qualitative analysis for benefits that cannot be quantified in economic or physical terms; and
 - The quality of the economic analysis and supporting documentation.
- Unsubstantiated, poor quality, or poorly documented economic analysis can result in the score being **reduced by up to 4 points**, provided that the final score is not less than the minimum score of 1.
- Exceptional documentation of benefits can result in the score being **increased by up to 4 points**, provided that the final score is not more than the maximum score of 5.

Table 3

Other Expected Benefits

- Scoring will be based on the certainty that the Proposal will provide the benefits claimed, as well as the magnitude and breadth of the other expected benefits.
 - Did the applicant provide qualitative or quantitative information describing the Other Expected Benefits of the Proposal?
 - Are the Other Expected Benefits claimed supported with adequate documentation?

Table 3

Other Expected Benefits

- The minimum score for this criterion is 1 point.
- The remaining 4 points will be allocated based:
 - The benefits realized through implementation and
 - The quality of the analysis and supporting documentation
- Points will be awarded based on a comparison... the benefits of the Proposals
 - High levels of Other Expected Benefits (3 to 4 points),
 - Average levels of Other Expected Benefits (2 to 3 points) and
 - Low levels of Other Expected Benefits (0 to 1 points)
- Unsubstantiated or poor quality analysis or documentation can result in the score being **reduced by up to 4 points**, provided that the final score is not less than the minimum score of 1.
- Exceptional documentation of the Other Expected Benefits can result in the score being **increased by up to 2 points**, provided that the final score is not more than the maximum score of 5.

Table 3

Scientific and Technical Merit

- Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the Proposal has scientific and technical merit.
 - Was each project contained in the Proposal supported by thorough and well-documented information?
 - Does the information contained in the technical documents support the technical feasibility for each project?
 - Were the necessary certifications provided in the application?
 - Were the documents referenced in the certifications provided in the application?
 - If feasibility or pilot studies have not been conducted for an individual project(s), was an explanation provided regarding what has been done to determine the project's feasibility?

Table 3

Scientific and Technical Merit

- **5 points** – all required certifications/documents are included and *Attachment 9* fully addresses the requirements for **each** of the projects in the Proposal with thorough supporting documentation
- **4 points** – all required certifications/documents are included and *Attachment 9* fully addresses the requirements for **a majority** of the projects in the Proposal with thorough supporting documentation
- **3 points** – all required certifications/documents are included and *Attachment 9* fully addresses the requirements for **less than a majority** of the projects in the Proposal with thorough supporting documentation
- **2 points** – all required certifications/documents are included and *Attachment 9* **does not** fully address the requirements for **any** of the projects in the Proposal nor provides adequate supporting documentation
- **1 point** – does not respond directly to the criteria

Table 3

Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

- Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented an adequate monitoring and assessment program including performance measures that will allow a determination of whether the objectives are met.
 - Did the application provide a plan to monitor and assess performance of the Proposal?
 - Were performance measures presented?
 - Were the monitoring, assessment, and performance measures supported by adequate documentation?
 - Will the proposed monitoring, assessment, and performance measures adequately demonstrate project benefits?
 - Did the application contain a discussion on post construction/initial implementation performance monitoring and does it appear to be reasonable?

Table 3

Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

- General Scoring Standard

Table 3

Program Preferences

- Scoring will be based on whether the Proposal will implement one or more of the specified IRWM Grant Program Preferences. Proposals that demonstrate significant, dedicated, and well-defined projects that meet multiple Program Preferences will be considered more favorably than Proposals that demonstrate a significant potential to meet a single Program Preference or demonstrate a low degree of commitment or certainty to meeting Program Preferences.
 - Does the Proposal include projects that implement Program Preferences?
 - Did the applicant demonstrate a high degree of certainty that the Proposal will implement the Program Preferences?
 - Did the applicant document the magnitude and breadth of Program Preferences that the Proposal will meet?

Table 3

Program Preferences

- **5 points** – implement **multiple** Program Preferences, demonstrates a **significant** degree of certainty..., and thoroughly documents the breadth and magnitude...
- **4 points** – implement a **single** Program Preference, demonstrate a **significant** degree of certainty..., and thoroughly documents the breadth and magnitude...
- **3 points** – implement **multiple** Program Preferences, demonstrates a **limited** degree of certainty..., and **lacks** thorough documentation that the breadth and magnitude...
- **2 points** – implement a **single** Program Preference, demonstrates a **limited** degree of certainty..., and **lacks** thorough documentation that the breadth and magnitude...
- **1 point** – **does not address** any Program Preference or... are **highly unlikely** to be implemented.

Table 3

Total Range of Possible Points

- Minimum Score 16 Points
- Maximum Score 80 Points

Schedule

- Public Comments Due
 - **August 19, 2005 by 5 p.m.**
 - Email or MS Word compatible file
 - Email to:

tracieb@water.ca.gov



Questions & Answers



Public Comments